



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,537	01/21/2004	Javier Sanchez	01480087aa	1097

30743 7590 12/01/2006

WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON & COOK, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 340
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

TAYLOR, BARRY W

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2617

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/760,537	Applicant(s) SANCHEZ, JAVIER	
	Examiner Barry W. Taylor	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redi (6,512,935) in view of Yoshimura (6,668,172) further in view of Hayakawa (6,738,412).

Regarding claim 5. Redi teaches a mobile terminal (figure 2), comprising:

a radio communication module (150 figure 2),

a central computing unit (130 figure 2),

a plurality of data processing software components designed to optimize operational performance of the mobile terminal (see 202, 216 and 307 in figure 4);

a communication interface designed to capture the traveling speed of the mobile terminal from an external source (170 figure 2); and

a command module designed to distribute the captured traveling speed to each of the data processing software components (col. 6 line 18 – col. 7 line 21).

According to Applicants, Redi only provides for a more rapid response for switching between communication links as speed increases, but does not address correction or compensation of communication channel degradation due to the mobile terminal speed (see paper dated 6/22/06, page 5 last five lines continuing to page 6 line

3). The Examiner notes that Redi also teaches motion rate supplied to different data processing software components (see 202, 216, and 307 in figure 4) so as to save power and reduce network overhead.

Yoshimura also teaches speed is fed to data processing software components (title, abstract, see items 51,52,53 in figure 4, col. 1 lines 52-58, col. 3 line 58 – col. 4 line 19, col. 5 lines 34-40, col. 9 line 16 – col. 10 line 20).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Yoshimura into the teachings of Suzuki in order to perform optimal reception processing according to the traveling state of the mobile thereby compensating for the deterioration of transmission quality thus improving on received signal characteristics.

Next, Applicants generally amend independent claim and argue that Redi in view of Yoshimura do not teach user inputs an estimate of traveling speed of mobile terminal (see Applicants general amendment and remark on the middle of page 5 wherein user directly inputs an approximation of the mobile speed, paper dated 9/29/06).

The Examiner notes that Applicants independent claim language is still vague in nature in that direct user input is not necessary or recited in the claim language.

In order to advance prosecution, Hayakawa teaches an alternative to using a speed detection section (see user inputs traveling speed of mobile device as an alternative method to using a speed detection section --- col. 20 lines 60-61, col. 7 lines 47-53) to be used in equations so base station and mobile may maintain synchronization (col. 1 line 62 – col. 2 line 7, col. 17 lines 45-60, col. 29 lines 38-45), as

well as, saving battery life (col. 3 lines 5-62, col. 10 lines 25-39, col. 15 lines 4-12, col. 18 lines 57-65, col. 22 lines 32-64, col. 29 lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use manual input as taught by Hayakawa into the teachings of Redi in view of Yoshimura in order to perform optimal reception processing according to the traveling state of the mobile thereby compensating for the deterioration of transmission quality thus improving on received signal characteristics, as well as, saving on battery life as disclosed by Hayakawa (col. 29 lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 6. Redi teaches means for wirelessly receiving traveling speed of mobile terminal (170 figure 2).

Regarding claim 1. Method claim 1 is rejected for the same reasons as apparatus claim 5 since the recited apparatus would perform the claimed method steps.

Regarding claim 2. Redi teaches wherein the captured traveling speed is distributed according to nature of processing of each data processing software component and value of the traveling speed (see figure 4 and col. 6 line 18 – col. 7 line 21).

Regarding claim 3. Hayakawa teaches user manually inputs traveling speed of mobile (see user inputs traveling speed of mobile device as an alternative method to using a speed detection section --- col. 20 lines 60-61, col. 7 lines 47-53)

Regarding claim 4. Redi teaches the traveling speed is detected automatically in real time by the mobile terminal (see 170 figure 2).

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redi (6,512,935) in view of Yoshimura (6,668,172) and Hayakawa (6,738,412) further in view of Aoki et al (2001/0044315 hereinafter Aoki).

Regarding claim 7. Redi in view of Yoshimura and Hayakawa do not show the transmitting traveling speed to a base station.

Aoki also teaches a radio communication system using variable packet length wherein mobile sends traveling speed to a base station (see last three lines of claims 1, 2 and 26) thereby detecting a mobile's speed more accurately (paragraph 0055) without using special and expensive structures (paragraph 0009).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Aoki into the teachings of Redi in view of Yoshimura and Hayakawa providing for a more accurate and less expensive system for determining speed of mobile unit.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barry W. Taylor, telephone number (571) 272-7509, who is available Monday-Thursday, 6:30am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost, can be reached at (571) 272-7872. The central facsimile phone number for this group is **571-273-8300**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2600 receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600, the 2600 Customer Service telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Centralized Delivery Policy: For patent related correspondence, hand carry deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), and facsimile transmissions must be sent to the central fax number **(571-273-8300)**.

Barry W. Taylor
Art Unit 2617



BARRY TAYLOR
PRIMARY EXAMINER